57,806

SUPPLEMENT TO THE

National Municipal Review

Vol. IX, No. 9 September, 1920 Total No. 51

THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

RALPH S. BOOTS

Columbia University

A comprehensive examination of the presidential primary at work with proposals of reform

PUBLISHED BY THE

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL LEAGUE

RAILROAD SQUARE, CONCORD, N. H.
EDITORIAL OFFICE, NORTH AMERICAN BUILDING
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Entered as second-class mattter April 15, 1914, at the post-office at Concord, New Hampshire, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	597
Summary of State Primary Laws	598
The Voice of the Primary	606
The Conduct of Instructed Delegates at the Convention	607
Present Defects	608
The Possibilities in the Primary	613
An Improved System	614
Table	617

THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

INTRODUCTION

The national conventions perform a function of extreme importance to the people of the nation. They select the two men from whom the voters select the president. But they are absolutely free from national regulation. Here is a strange situation. The constitution declares that congress may at any time make or alter regulations for the election of congressmen, but provides for the election of president that "each state shall appoint in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors. . . ." Thus the states seem to have complete control over the election of the members of the electoral college within their respective boundaries. The discretionary power of this body between the voters and the president has long since disappeared.

National conventions, on the other hand, have retained their discretionary power and remained a law unto themselves. With an understanding of the principles of the transmission of political power, the people have attempted within the past decade to remove all unnecessary intermediate belts and cogs between themselves and their agents, the party candidates for president. They are not satisfied to take one or the other of two candidates submitted to them by the politicians. The means devised to allow popular wishes directly to determine the nomination of the president is the so-called presidential primary. It is provided solely by state law, partly because of the constitutional provision that the presidential electors should be chosen by the states, and partly because of the position of the states in the party system. The laws of no two states are exactly alike, but there are, however, two chief forms: one provides for the direct election of the delegates to the national conventions; the other gives the opportunity to the voters to express a preference among the aspirants for the nomination who have complied with the state regulations for getting their names on the ballot. The terms presidential primary and presidential preference primary have been popularly applied to both forms. It is preferable not to use the latter term except for the latter form. Most states employing the presidential primary combine these forms. The former alone is not a direct primary at all, but takes on the appearance of directness in proportion as provisions are made for allowing or requiring the candidates for delegate to pledge themselves to support some particular aspirant for the nomination. The preference vote under the latter form does not count directly for any aspirant but only indirectly through the vote of the delegates in the convention, and hence is in the nature of an instruction more or less binding.

In 1912 the laws of twelve states provided for some form of the presidential primary. These states were entitled to 360 delegates in the conventions, about one third of the total. In 1916 twenty states compelled the use of the primary; the Republican convention included 581 delegates from these states, and the Democratic, 584. In 1920 two additional states[1] required the

[1] North Carolina and West Virginia. The North Carolina law seems to have been passed in 1915. The Legislative Reference Library states no presidential primary was held in 1916. The West Virginia State Historian and Archivist reports that a presidential primary was held in 1916.

presidential primary and two had discarded it—Iowa and Minnesota in 1917 after a single experience of its operation. It is reported that Iowa considered the law useless and expensive—the primary cost $129,000. Minnesota voters are said to have been disgusted by their inability in 1916 to vote for Roosevelt, who did not become a candidate in the primary. Florida, Alabama and Georgia have permissive presidential primary provisions.

The delegates to San Francisco in 1920 from primary states (not territories) numbered 638. To the Chicago convention this year 569 delegates were elected from primary states.

How far have these state laws been effective in substituting a direct for an indirect nomination of presidential candidates? To answer this question requires first a brief analysis of the state laws and their operation.

STATE PRIMARY LAWS SUMMARIZED

California. Presidential primary held the first Tuesday in May; regular state primary, last Tuesday in August. The preference vote was discarded after 1916. Delegates elected at large. The candidates for delegate may be grouped, provided each group contains from two to four members from each congressional district. Each group must have the endorsement of the candidate for president for whom the members of the group have filed a preference, or of a state organization not repudiated by him. Each candidate for delegate may file a statement declaring his preference and promising to support this preference to the best of his ability. Neglect to file the statement does not keep a candidate's name off the ballot but does keep the names of a group off the ballot or prevent a candidate's name from appearing in a group. Each voter is given the ballot of the party with which he declares it is his intention to affiliate, and is sent the sample ballots of all parties. The author of the act specifically states that election at large was provided partly to increase the political influence of the state. The Republican primary vote this year was almost one fourth larger than the general election vote for Hughes in 1916. The Democratic vote was one twentieth the last vote for Wilson. This indicates the voting of a large number of Democrats in the Republican primary.

Indiana. First Tuesday after the first Monday in May. At the same time comes the regular state general primary. The voter casts a preference vote for president and elects delegates from each county to the state convention, which in turn chooses the national delegates. Party rules may permit the delegates from each congressional district to select the national district delegates. The Republican party uses this method. In case an aspirant receives a majority of the party vote the delegates are considered instructed and it becomes their duty to cast their votes as a unit for such candidate as long as his name is before the convention. The voter is given any party's ballot that he requests unless challenged, when he must make affidavit that at the last election he voted for a majority of the candidates of that party. It will be observed here that if no candidate polls a majority vote, the law's only effect is to govern the election of the state convention. At the last primary, Wood had the largest vote in nine congressional districts and Johnson the highest vote in the other four, but the Republican organization, favorable to Harding, succeeded in electing most of the delegates to the state convention. Of the 26 district delegates, 6 were instructed for Wood and 4 for Johnson at

the state convention. Three of the four delegates at large were personally opposed to Wood but instructed to vote for him as long as he had a fair chance to be nominated. It was understood that not more than one delegate of the thirty was really for Johnson. On the first two ballots in the national convention the delegates voted as the preference pluralities in the state and districts went. On the third ballot delegates began to leave Wood and Johnson. The *Indianapolis News* asserted that scores of Democrats asked for and voted Republican ballots in the Indianapolis precincts with the result that in many cases the "Republican" primary vote exceeded the Republican vote for secretary of state two years before.

Illinois. Third Tuesday in April. State primary the Wednesday after the second Tuesday in September. Preferential vote and direct election of district delegates. Precinct committeemen are elected who select delegates to the state convention which chooses the national delegates at large. The vote for president has for its sole purpose an expression of the sentiment of the party voters and the vote of the state at large is considered advisory to the delegates at large and that of the congressional district to the district delegates. Each candidate for delegate is required to file a statement of his choice for president or a statement that he has no choice. A candidate for president may disavow the candidacy of a person who designates him as a choice and prevent that person's name from appearing on the ballot. The voter at the primary must declare his party affiliation and must not have voted at the primary of any other party for two years. The Illinois law permits the possibility that the state preference will favor one candidate, that the majority of the district delegates will favor another, and that the state convention will favor a third.

Maryland. First Monday in May. At the same time nominations for United States representatives and for all offices to be filled at the presidential election are made, but on other than presidential years the state primary comes between the eighth and fifteenth of September. The Maryland primary is quite unique. There is a preference vote for president but delegates to the national convention are elected by a state convention whose members are chosen by direct vote at the presidential primary. The preference vote is counted separately in each county, and in instructing the national delegates, the delegations from these areas are required to vote at the state convention, in accordance with the preference of the voters in their respective counties, as long as there is any possibility of such preference obtaining a majority of the vote in the convention, and as long as this preference receives the vote of any nine counties. Delegates to the national convention are instructed for the candidate receiving the majority vote of the state convention and are bound to support him as long as there is possibility of his nomination. If there is no presidential candidate in the primary the state convention may instruct for whom it pleases or not at all. At the primary the voters are given the opportunity to vote for an uninstructed delegation in the same manner as for a candidate, with the same effect on the delegates to the state convention. A presidential aspirant must pay a fee of $25 for each county in which his name is to appear on the ballot. Party registration is required.

Massachusetts. Last Tuesday in April. State primary six weeks before the fall election. Delegates to the national convention are directly elected

by districts and at large, the distribution being determined by the state committees, provided each district elects at least one delegate. Candidates for delegate may have their names printed in groups and a single mark will count for the group. The secretary of state certifies the preference vote to the state committees. There is apparently no provision to make the state or district preference votes effective or binding. It seems that the delegate's preference for president may be printed after his name on the ballot. There is no assurance that the preference vote and the vote for pledged delegates will correspond or that the delegates at large and the district delegates will favor the same candidate. What happened in 1912 may happen again; no effort seems to have been made to prevent it. In 1916 an act was passed to confine voters to the primary of their own party by an enrollment scheme. The *Boston Transcript* gives two reasons for the apathy of the voters this year: first, their conviction that the candidates for delegate were insincere in their professions of support for the different presidential aspirants and their resentment at the interference of the state committees; second, the inconclusiveness of the Massachusetts system which afforded no opportunity for a direct vote on presidential aspirants since no one had filed a petition and in only six of the sixteen districts had the candidates for delegate announced themselves favorable to Wood. Editorially the *Transcript* charges that the primary law enables the candidate for delegate to prostitute the popularity of presidential possibilities to his own political aggrandizement and often leaves the voter ignorant of his would-be delegate's principles and choice for president.

Michigan. First Monday in April. State primary last Tuesday in August. The law is brief, providing only a preference vote for nominee and national committeeman. Only 100 voters need sign the candidate's petition. The candidate receiving the highest vote is declared to be the choice of the party for the state. The law seems to allow the voters full choice of party, by requiring that he shall be "furnished a ballot," presumably that of any party he likes. The choice of delegates is left entirely to the party regulations. Although Johnson this year received a large plurality in the state, Wood carried eight of the thirteen congressional districts and his backers contended that the state convention should leave the way open for a change to him after the delegation had discharged its obligation to Senator Johnson on the first ballot. The state convention, according to the *Detroit Free Press*, chose three of the four delegates at large opposed to Johnson. The delegation stood solidly for Johnson until the sixth ballot.

Montana. Forty-fifth day before the first Monday in June. State primary seventy days before the fall election. Preference vote and direct election of delegates on a general ticket. The names are arranged alphabetically and the voter votes for the state's quota. Presidential aspirants are designated for the primary by petitions of their personal supporters in Montana without themselves signing any petition or acceptance. Each delegate is paid his expenses, not to exceed $200, and must take an oath of office that he will to the best of his judgment and ability faithfully carry out the wishes of his political party. Candidates for the presidential nomination may use the official campaign book on payment of a fee. Montana has the "open" primary. The voter is handed the ballots of all parties, from which he selects the one he wishes to use. Statutes passed by the last legislature

providing the "closed" primary and the rotation of the names on the ballot were held up by a referendum petition.

Nebraska. Third Tuesday in April. General state primary. In other than presidential years state primary third Tuesday in August. Four delegates at large and two from each district and the national committeemen are directly elected. There is also a preference vote. Presidential aspirants are designated, without acceptance on their part, by petitions containing 500 names in each congressional district. No provision exists for putting delegates on record for any candidate nor for binding them to support the candidate of highest vote in the state, and a court decision indicates that the delegates are only morally bound by the preference vote. Senator Johnson has publicly attacked what he calls the perfidy of the Nebraska delegation. A voter at the primary must state his party affiliation and, except in cities where registration is required, may state any party he pleases subject to a challenge on the ground of party membership to be satisfied by an oath as to his intention. A good authority declares that thousands of Democrats voted in the Republican primary this year.

New Hampshire. Second Tuesday in March. This is the earliest presidential primary. State primary first Tuesday in September. Delegates are directly elected—at large and by districts. There is no preference vote, although a candidate for delegate may have printed after his name the words: "Pledged to vote for the nomination of —— for president." The state committee may fill vacancies in the list of candidates for delegate if fewer than the state's quota file petitions. If a voter's party membership has been registered he is limited to the primary of that party; if not, he may join any party subject to challenge and oath.

New Jersey. Fourth Tuesday in April. State primary fourth Tuesday in September. Direct election of delegates and preference vote. Distribution of delegates is made by the state committee chairmen in accordance with the call of the national committee. Candidates for delegates may be grouped and have the name of the presidential candidate they favor placed opposite the group or opposite individual names under the caption, "Choice for President," or any six word slogan may be used. Voters are confined to the party in the primary of which they voted the preceding year. The secretary of state is required publicly to announce the preference vote, apparently only for the state as a unit. There is no attempt in the law to bind any delegate either by the vote of his district or the vote of the state or by his own expressed preference. The delegate must decide what he will do. The practice in New Jersey seems to have been for the delegate at large to feel bound by the state preference vote and the district delegate by the district preference, although in 1912 four anti-Wilson delegates from Essex county supported Clark to the last ballot regardless of the fact that Wilson's name alone was on the ballot. There is a stringent act on election expenditures broad enough in terms to cover the presidential primary. The amount spent in aid of the candidacy of a delegate is specifically limited to $5,000. This limitation would permit a presidential candidate or his friends to spend $140,000 in the state.

The party and public offices held by the delegates of this year will be of interest. Of the Republicans, two were United States senators, one chairman of the state committee and ex-governor, one ex-governor and state senator, two state senators, one county clerk, one county chairman and mayor, two

judges, four members of the advisory committee to the chairman of the Essex county committee. Of the twenty-eight Democrats, one was governor, one ex-state committeeman and member of the Essex county committee, two United States representatives, one chairman of a county committee, three state committeemen, four mayors of leading cities, one county clerk, two state senators, one collector of internal revenue, one leader of last session of assembly, two city commissioners of two largest cities in the state, one member of a county executive committee, and one member of a state commission. After the Republican convention some of the New Jersey papers attempted to indicate which five delegates voted for Senator Harding. In the absence of a poll of the delegation there seems to be no means of putting a national delegate on record in the exercise of his most important function.

New York. First Tuesday in April. State primary seventh Tuesday before fall election. Delegates are directly elected, not more than four at large. There is no preference vote and no provision for a delegate to indicate on the ballot his choice for president. Designating petitions for delegate at large must contain 3,000 signatures and for district delegate, 500. There is a strict party enrollment law.

The details of the New York primary of this year are instructive. The primary was held on April 6. In the *New York Times* of February 4 appeared the statement that the Democratic state committee would hold a meeting to consider the calling of an unofficial state convention for the proposal or endorsement of delegates at large and district delegates to the national convention. A letter to the Democratic state chairman asking for information on the composition of this convention and the method of selecting the members elicited no reply and the newspapers contain no account of an election of delegates. A district leader in New York county, however, vouchsafed the information that each state committeeman was entitled to attend the convention along with two persons whom he selected to accompany him. The Republicans also held an unofficial convention which had for its avowed purpose the adoption of a platform and the recommending of delegates at large to the Republican voters. The necessity or advantage of a platform at this time is hardly apparent to the naked eye. Elections to choose delegates to this convention were held, in New York city at any rate, at the various assembly district headquarters. A request by letter to the Republican state chairman for the vote for these delegates brought no response. The vote for delegate in the eleventh assembly district was printed in the *Times* as 126, the result of a contest which was apparently the single exception to complete harmony in the Manhattan caucuses. The Republican enrollment in the eleventh district in 1919 was 8,181. Party leaders stated that no significance attached to the selection of these delegates as far as the presidential situation was concerned.

To head off any trouble that might be started in the Republican convention the state committee first named the "big four" delegates and alternates. At the Democratic convention a complete slate of delegates was proposed for "recommendation" to the voters. The "recommendation" was accepted with hardly a murmur of disapproval. In 39 of the 43 districts absolutely no choice among delegates was offered to the Democratic voter who went to the polls on April 6 out of a sense of civic duty. The organization candidates in the Republican primaries made a clean sweep. In only 16 of the 43 dis-

tricts were there contests. Only one man contested the choice of the machine for delegate at large and he was a Hoover supporter. About a quarter of the Republican voters went to the polls and 15 per cent of the Democrats. Among the Democratic delegates were 23 state committeemen, district leaders or congressmen; among the Republican delegates were 33 persons of similar political positions while only 34 of the 88 delegates did not hold public or party office. The number of officials, party and public, who find places on the delegations is not really a matter of much moment because the preliminaries, if considered in connection with the result of the primaries, show that the state committee members could probably secure their election to the conventions to the number to which the state is entitled, if they chose to do so. The *Evening Post's* editorial on the primary was headed, "The Primary Vindicated": it asserted there could be no disappointment among friends of the primary over the way in which it had done what it was intended to do; that Governor Hughes never held it up as anything more than an opportunity for the effective expression of the will of the party voter. That the opportunity was very imperfectly realized this year would be the testimony of most intelligent voters, but the voters may have been responsible for the lack of opportunity. To state what principle or what candidate he was supporting in his vote for delegate would have been beyond the conjecture of the great majority of the voters.

North Carolina. First Saturday in June. Latest presidential primary. General state primary at the same time. Preference vote. All delegates at large and district delegates are held bound to support the candidate receiving the majority of the preference vote. If no candidate receives a majority, the plurality governs in each congressional district and in the state at large respectively. The intent of this provision is not very clear in the absence of interpretation. How far the delegate is "bound" by the preference vote is not indicated. There seems, as in the case of Michigan, to be no provision whatever for the election of the national delegates. A declaration and record of party membership is required of the voters before participation in the primary.

North Dakota. Third Tuesday of March. Regular state primary last Wednesday in June. Preference vote. Delegates are elected directly on a general ticket. Recommendation of a national committeeman by the primary vote. Each elector receives the ballot of the party with which he declares himself affiliated or with which he may have registered. Expenses of delegates to the national convention are paid to the amount of $200. Every delegate must subscribe an oath that he will to the best of his judgment and ability faithfully carry out the wishes of his party. The privilege of the publicity pamphlet does not seem to be available to the candidates for president and delegates.

Ohio. Last Tuesday in April. State primary second Tuesday of August. Preference vote. Direct election of delegates. The candidate for delegate must state his first and second choice for president with the consent of the presidential aspirants indicated. These choices appear with the candidate's name on the ballot. The candidate for delegate may also file a statement that he will support the candidate for president who receives the highest vote in the party. It does not appear whether this statement is printed on the ballot or whether the delegate is to support the choice of the state or of the district.

The name of no candidate for president is to be submitted to the voters without his consent. Voters are restricted to the primary of their own party.

Oregon. Third Friday in May, general state primary. National delegates, four at large and two from each district, are directly elected, and also national committeemen. Preference vote. The declaration of candidacy of a delegate must contain his promise to use his best efforts to secure the nomination of the voters' preference. The delegate may file in a statement of 100 words the names of candidates or principles in which he especially believes, and may indicate the 12 words that he desires printed on the ballot. Both candidates for delegate and for the presidential nomination are entitled to use the official publicity pamphlet on payment of the fee. Voters are registered in their respective parties. It will be noticed that the state is the unit in the preference vote and that each delegate must pledge his support of the statewide preference. Oregon, like Montana, has given up the system of election at large in which each voter could vote for only one delegate. The result in Oregon in 1912 was the election of a mixture of LaFollette, Roosevelt, and Taft men pledged by the preference vote to Roosevelt. As a consequence, part of the delegation supported the movement which gave the Taft forces control of the convention, yet the present Oregon law by no means guarantees the selection of delegates honestly favorable to the state's preferred candidate. All of the districts may not go as the state goes in preference; and further, due to the failure of some who vote a presidential preference to vote for a delegate, even the delegates at large may not personally desire the success of the state's favorite. This year although Johnson had a plurality of about 2,000, the avowed Johnson delegates were defeated and the manager of the Wood campaign was among the delegates elected.

Pennsylvania. Third Tuesday in May. Regular spring primary for all the candidates for offices to be filled at the general election. Fall primary, the third Tuesday in September, in odd years. Preference vote and direct election of delegates. In 1912 delegates at large were chosen at a state convention and no preference vote was provided for. The distribution of delegates is certified to the secretary of the commonwealth by the chairman of the state committees. After the names of all candidates for delegate there must be printed on the ballot one of two statements: that the delegate promises or does not promise to support for the presidential nomination with all fidelity in all matters coming before the convention the popular choice of his party in the state (if a delegate at large) or in the district (if a district delegate) according as he has or has not filed a statement of this promise. This year the name of only one candidate for the Republican preference vote was printed on the ballot, that of a retired business man of Philadelphia, Edward Randolph Wood. The result was somewhat disconcerting to those whose confidence in plebiscites is unshaken. Mr. Wood polled about 258,000 votes out of a total Republican preference vote of 279,000. Some 3,900 voters wrote in the name of Leonard Wood. Just what was in the minds of the 258,000 adherents of Mr. E. R. Wood is not absolutely certain but probably the joke is on them. It is rather needless to say that the Pennsylvania delegation did not consider themselves under obligation to support the state's recorded choice.

South Dakota. Fourth Tuesday in March. General state primary. Prob-

ably the most elaborate and complex presidential primary law. A sort of state convention may by majority vote propose candidates for the presidency, national committeemen, and delegates to the national convention. Any five or more members of the convention may propose an additional set of candidates, and finally, independent proposals may be made by petition. Delegates are apparently elected at large, but not much importance is attached to their election because the endorsement of a presidential candidate and of his paramount issue at the primary has the force and effect of instruction to the delegates, who must then vote for such candidate at least three times before supporting any compromise candidate. A primary publicity pamphlet and a joint debate between the presidential candidates or their representatives are provided for. The state seems to be the unit for the preference vote. No pledge is considered necessary for the delegates, who make no indication of their choice of candidates. At the last primary no candidates for delegate other than those of the state proposal meeting were put up. A voter requests any party ballot he wishes and if challenged on the ground of party membership must make oath that he is in good faith a member of the party.

Vermont. Third Tuesday in March. Regular state primary second Tuesday in September. State conventions, held within three weeks after the primary, select delegates to the national conventions. Delegates to the state conventions do not seem to be elected at the primary but according to the direction of the state committees. There is no provision to bind the delegates or to secure the election of delegates in sympathy with the successful primary candidate. There is no restriction on voting in the primary based on party affiliation.

West Virginia. Last Tuesday in May. At the same time the general state primary is held, which, in other years, comes the first Tuesday in August. Preference vote and direct election of delegates. There is nothing to indicate a rule of apportionment except the mention of delegates among state officers and again among district officers. A candidate for delegate files a statement as to whether or not he will support for the party nominee the popular choice of the primary either in the district or the state, according as he is a district or state delegate. This statement does not seem to be printed on the ballot. The corrupt practices act applies specifically to delegates and presidential aspirants but in fixing the maximum amounts of expenditure neither presidential candidate nor delegate is mentioned.

Wisconsin. First Tuesday in April. State primary biennially on the first Tuesday in September. Four delegates are elected at large and two from each district. Preference vote also. The alternate delegates are appointed by the state committees. In California the alternates are selected by the delegates and either of these systems has much to commend it. No consent is required from an aspirant for president to the use of his name at the primary. Any candidate for delegate may have printed after his name on the ballot a five word statement of principles or candidates favored by him. The primary is "open," as in Montana, and the voter receives the ballots of all parties. There seems to be no special provision for holding the delegates to the support of the people's choice for president. There is really no evidence of intention that such choice should bind the delegates.

RECAPITULATION

This review of the presidential primary laws in these twenty states may be briefly recapitulated. Three states, Vermont, Michigan, North Carolina, provide for a preference vote on the presidential aspirants but make no provision whatever for the selection of delegates. Two other states, Indiana and Maryland, take a preference vote and allow the national delegates to be selected by state conventions, for which the delegates are chosen at the time of the preference vote. Three states, New York, New Hampshire, California, provide for the direct election of delegates, but not for a preference vote, although California's grouping arrangement is practically equivalent to a preference vote, and New Hampshire allows delegates to pledge themselves to support certain presidential candidates. The remaining states elect delegates directly (except delegates at large in Illinois) and permit the voters an expression of preference among aspirants. Montana, North Dakota and probably South Dakota (with California), select their quotas on a general ticket.

THE VOICE OF THE PRIMARY

Back in 1912 as the returns from the presidential primary elections became public, it was a commonly expressed opinion in the daily and periodical press that probably the last old-fashioned pre-convention campaign was being witnessed. Eight years later the primaries and conventions have again been held, and if this year the former had any influence on the latter, it remains invisible and intangible. Both conventions are apparently as free as ever to select candidates, and there is no repetition of the 1912 comment as to the end of the convention system. But there seems to be continued widespread dissatisfaction with that system and voluble lament that the presidential primary is a "farce." True, Will Irwin's statement that the people of the United States have as much influence in selecting the president as the British have in choosing a crown prince appears to be no great exaggeration, or is not so obviously to be classed under the rhetorical category of hyperbole. If the administration of either Mr. Harding or Mr. Cox should prove disastrous, the blame which could be directly attached to the voters of the Republican or Democratic party for an unwise nomination would be slight indeed. Do the voters wish to determine the party candidate? Should the candidate be the voters' choice? Are the voters capable of making a wise selection? A popular referendum would certainly answer in the affirmative. Yet in 1912, when there was no doubt about the primary's favorite in the Republican party, a convention turned him down. The fact that twelve states used the primary, however, could not furnish a conclusive reason to the convention for throwing over the old system, which most states had retained. And the verdict of the old system was quite as clear as that of the new. There was a conflict of systems. One need not be a convinced Democrat to see some good results of the Republican primary of that year. On the other hand, the pronouncement of the Democratic primary in 1912 was less certain, although the Democratic convention's action is thought by many to have disregarded the people's choice. In 1916 the primary was an automaton in one party and an idle implement in the other. In the one any conceivable system would have worked the same way. In the other even an improved primary would probably have uttered a Delphic response.

This year it is true the primary in the Republican party made no pronounced decision, and in the Democratic party was practically neglected by presidential aspirants. To be specific, the presidential primary sent to the Republican convention 84 delegates from eight states instructed for or pledged to Wood, probably 96 from nine states; 140 delegates from nine states for Johnson, possibly 142 from ten states; 41 delegates from one state for Lowden, and 39 delegates from one state for Harding—a total of 306 or 320 from 15 or 16 of the 20 primary states. At the Democratic convention, Palmer had 104 delegates from two states; Cox 48, Hoover 30, Simmons 24, Hitchcock 16, McAdoo 10, and Gerard 10, each from one state; possibly Edwards 28 and Bryan 10,—although their names were not on the ballots,—a total of 242 or 280 from ten states.

The charge that the primary has failed is beside the point. A presidential primary has not been tried. In a measure, a charge of failure to solve the Irish problem might as justly be laid against the congress of the United States. The states have attempted to control the actions of a body outside their jurisdiction, and fewer than half the states have made the attempt. Dissatisfaction with the primary in the Republican party proves on careful analysis to be in part an unconscious discontent with the unfair apportionment of delegates. Anyway, one would hardly assert that a state employs the direct primary for the nomination of governor if only half the counties took a direct vote on a candidate and certified the returns to a convention that is in no way bound by them.[1] And as long as a candidate may elect to run only where his chances are good, and argue as to the rest of the field that the voters had no opportunity to support him, there is hardly a real primary.

An examination of the tabular record of the primary will hardly tempt the wary student into the positive assertion of any conclusion. The factors are too variable. One could wish to discover (1) whether participation has increased; (2) the effect of the time at which the primary is held; (3) the relation between the opportunity to express a choice for president and the extent of participation; and (4) whether combining the presidential primary with the state primary results in a larger participation than when it is held alone. Perhaps the more discerning can read from the record answers to these queries.

THE CONDUCT OF INSTRUCTED DELEGATES AT THE CONVENTION

If the primary in its present form accomplishes anything, it does so by controlling the actions of the delegates at the conventions. Here the facts may be studied, and the attitude of the delegates from the convention states compared with that of those from the primary states. It may be observed that Senator Harding's gain of 309 votes—from $65\frac{1}{2}$ to $374\frac{1}{2}$—during the eight ballots after the first, came with the exception of 107, from the non-primary states. Of these 107, eleven came from Indiana and 18 from North Carolina where delegates are not directly elected (in Indiana the preference vote is an instruction to the delegates only if some aspirant polls a majority) and 64 came from New York where there is no preference vote. Thus only 14 of the 309 votes came from states having both a preference vote and direct election of delegates.

[1] The states undoubtedly have a means of control, if they wish to use it, in their power to determine the method of choosing presidential electors. Here is a lever which no state has brought into play.

On the tenth and last ballot the delegates from California, Montana, Vermont, and Wisconsin were sticking solidly to their respective state preferences. One half or more of the delegates from Maryland, New Jersey, Oregon, and South Dakota were holding out for the preferences of their constituents. All or a majority of the delegates from eight primary states—Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia—where preference votes were taken, had deserted their state preferences at some stage of the balloting. It is fair to say that the preferences of Pennsylvania and West Virginia never had any chance of nomination and that Indiana's preference vote did not constitute an instruction.

The action of the delegates of a few particular states should be noted. West Virginia cast only one solid vote for her favorite son and only one of the delegates voted for him as long as the fifth ballot. This seems to be a plain case of riding to the convention on state pride and of remaining quite "unhitched" at the beginning of the fun. Senator Johnson lost one of the instructed Oregon delegates on the first ballot and retained only one half of them on the fourth. The delegate who failed to give Johnson his first vote explained that he was known to favor Wood before the primary and that he did not consider himself bound by the Oregon vote notwithstanding his pledge to be governed by the will of the voters. Two of the North Dakota delegates supported Wood on the first ballot although Johnson was the only candidate to run in the state primary and the law required them to take an oath faithfully to carry out the wishes of their political party. Not any of the Michigan delegates deserted Johnson until the sixth ballot, though some were almost certainly opposed to him and unbound by any oath. The Nebraska delegation did not support Johnson unanimously even on the first ballot; on the seventh ballot, the senator retained only three of the sixteen Nebraskans. The North Carolina case was probably the most notable, Johnson defeated Wood in the primary over two to one, and the state law binds the delegates to support the majority candidate, yet on the first ballot Johnson received only one vote, and at no time more than four votes, while on the fifth ballot the delegation began to go over to Harding.

SOME PRACTICAL DEFECTS

Certain fairly obvious defects of the present presidential primary system, or remediable conditions under which it operates inefficiently, may be quite definitely stated as a preliminary to suggestions of possible improvements:

(1) The fact that the national conventions are entirely beyond the reach of state law. Their observance of state regulations is at present optional.

(2) The use of the primary in fewer than half of the states.

(3) The variations in the dates of the primaries in the different states—from the second Tuesday in March to the first Saturday in June.

(4) The imperfections of existing state laws, which make their results ambiguous.

(5) The difficulty of controlling a pledged delegation.

(6) The lack of provisions to insure that the delegates chosen by the state shall honestly desire the nomination of the state's preference.

(7) The influence of local politics.

(8) The failure of aspirants to submit their names to the voters except in the states where they feel confident of victory.

(9) The "favorite son" game.

(10) The expenditure required of aspirants who make a fairly complete caucus, and the absence of restraint on undue expenditure.

(11) The participation of voters of one party in the primaries of the other.

(12) The failure of so many voters to participate at all that the result loses significance. These last three defects are listed as the most serious, by Dr. Talcott Williams in a recent article.

As to why the presidential primary has not been more widely adopted, it may be said that its satisfactory operation is difficult to secure. The politicians of a state fully appreciate their disadvantage and the state's disadvantage from the standpoint of political influence if the state delegation is committed to one candidate as long as his name is before the convention, since the power to bargain is lost. There is hardly any satisfactory intermediate point between merely recommending a preferred candidate to a delegation and binding the delegation throughout the convention. Neither extreme is at all satisfactory; the former, unless a nomination is made on the first ballot, leaves the delegation quite free to disregard the state's preference, and the latter might, if it could be adequately enforced by several states, deadlock the convention completely. Bargains there will be of necessity in a convention until a first ballot nomination can be assured.

There have been surprisingly few earnest attempts since 1912 to bring the primary to the highest attainable degree of perfection in the states which have adopted it. As indicated above, many states combine a preference vote and a direct election of delegates in such careless manner that the result of the election may be unintelligible or conflicting. To illustrate: a preference vote is provided without any declaration in the law as to whether the state vote shall bind all the delegates, or only the delegates at large, leaving the district delegates to follow the preferences of their respective districts. At the same time candidates for delegate may state personal preferences or pledges. In such a situation it is not only not improbable that the state preference shall go one way and the majority of district preferences another, but it is not impossible that a delegate shall be elected who has expressed a preference or pledge for an aspirant that receives neither the highest district nor state vote. Most states take no precaution whatever to insure the election of delegates sincerely in sympathy with the candidate whom the state prefers. Here is a most serious obstacle to the effectuation of popular will which the states could remove. California stands almost alone in having practically overcome this difficulty. Certainly no candidate for delegate should be permitted to pose as the supporter of any presidential aspirant without the latter's endorsement.

But the election at large feature of the law of California and other states is impossible to defend. Probably nothing tends more to weaken the influence of a state-wide preference vote than its manifest unfairness, frequently admitted in the popular mind, in that a slight plurality is sufficient to establish a claim to all the delegates. Inequality in a law undoubtedly impairs the force of its obligation to observance.

There is trustworthy evidence to show that if the voters of one party are free to go into the primary of the other and find an incentive to do so in the fact that there is a contest in the other party and not in their own, they generally go in considerable numbers. This is to be expected. It is probable that parties will not be satisfied to

commit the selection of their candidates to a primary so long as these invasions are possible. When both parties have contests, there will not be much mixing. However, there will be repetitions of the 1916 Democratic situation.

The bad effects of diversity of primary dates hardly need to be discussed. "General Wood's campaign forces came into the state like a circus," asserted a witness before the senate committee investigating expenditures. When a metropolitan daily's political correspondent tells its readers that the primary returns in a certain state may be accepted as indicative of the relative popular strength of the aspirants, it is no wonder that heaven and earth are moved to gain a plurality. In 1845 congress established, for selecting presidential electors, a uniform day throughout the country; and in 1872 a uniform date in nearly all the states for the selection of national representatives.

The comment from almost every state is that local politics constitutes an important factor in the outcome of the primary, especially in the election of delegates. The following quotation from the *New York Evening Post* is suggestive: "At various times other candidates and their managers have sent agents to look over the field and decide whether or not to make a fight. Their conclusion has always been that there were too many cross-currents of local politics within the state and too many questions of local personalities involved to make it possible to get a fair contest between national leaders." Only the complete elimination of the delegate as a solicitor of votes promises to improve this situation. Nor does the selection of delegates who have indicated no preferences among aspirants insure the popular choice of a candidate. If the primary were a contest among a few well-known men on the basis of popular confidence in their judgment, this would be a step toward as nearly a deliberative convention as is possible. Further, only a complex proportional system of electing delegates would assure the proper distribution of delegates among the aspirants, whether they were elected at large or by district.

Should all the present primary states perfect their laws, they would constitute an insufficient portion of the country to be decisive. The majority of the voters may not have spoken at all or may have given an uncertain sound. Obviously, the primaries can not be effective until all the leading aspirants have taken the opinion of a large part of the country. If the primaries this year had been accepted as decisive, there could have been no consideration of other Republican candidates than Wood and Johnson. But the convention may still advance plausible arguments for disregarding the primary returns. General Wood's name appeared on the primary ballots in fourteen states, Senator Johnson's in twelve, Governor Lowden's in six, Mr. Hoover's in four, and Senator Harding's in three. These five aspirants all contested Montana; Wood, Johnson, Lowden, and Harding contested Indiana; the first three and Hoover contested Michigan and Oregon; the first three contested South Dakota. With the opportunity to do so in twenty states, in only five states did three or more of the candidates submit their names to the voters. Only one Democratic aspirant ran in the primaries of more than one state and he in only two. The primary process has reached a sort of impasse. "That General Wood should be contending with Governor Lowden in his home state represents a political error on his part," reads one newspaper paragraph. If one aspir-

ant makes a campaign in all the primary states he probably arouses the opposition of other aspirants who combine against him, and the primary's favorite risks defeat in the convention; if he does not enter the lists the voters are limited to expressing meaningless and silly preferences among "impossibles, improbables, and unknowns," and the purpose of the primary is equally defeated.

The states could probably have dealt with the question of presidential primary campaign expenses quite effectively. Very few have made any effort to do so. In many states, the terms of the general election law on expenditures seem broad enough to include the presidential primary but in few has the filing of accounts been reported. The opponents of primaries find the expenditures of primary candidates a favorite theme. This expense is objectionable, but it little becomes advocates of a return to the pure convention system to attack the cost of the primary. Assuming roughly that General Wood's campaign in fourteen primary states cost $1,500,000, the average for each state was about $100,000. If Senator Johnson's expenditure in twelve states was $250,000, the average per state was $20,000; if his expense in California be excluded, this figure would be about $10,000. Governor Lowden's average was approximately $70,000; Senator Harding's $35,000; and Mr. Hoover's $25,000 on the above basis. From these figures and the primary results it is obvious that something besides money frequently determines the outcome of primaries. More to the point is the admitted expenditure by Governor Lowden's manager of $38,000 in the pure convention state of Missouri, an expenditure which is still the subject of discussion at gatherings of the party chiefs. It is reported that General Wood's expenditure in New Jersey was $15,000 and in Maryland $12,500, both primary states; this may be compared with the sending of $10,000 to Georgia by Mr. Hitchcock, because the opposition was "reported spending large sums in the state." Georgia casts approximately 11,000 Republican votes and selects delegates by the convention system. If a candidate and his friends can raise a certain amount of money to spend in securing a nomination, it seems fairly reasonable to believe that they will spend it, convention or primary, unless convinced that the nomination is certain or hopeless before the maximum is reached. It may be that this assurance is more readily obtained under the convention system. A better day and a stricter conscience are coming in the matter of money in elections. Witness this statement from the *Nation* in 1912: "The $70,000 spent by Roosevelt in New York county was a public scandal, of which there should be no repetition." A Missouri politician has recently testified, seemingly as a sort of naïve justification for receiving money in this year's presidential primary, that the amount was considerably less than he received in 1912. There is reason to believe that the primary this year will lead to desirable legislation on campaign expenditures, which would not have been brought about under the older system had the expenditures been equally large.

IS IT TIME FOR A CHANGE?

What of the future? If it is desirable for the people to elect the president, it is essential that they should nominate him, and if they are to nominate him the method must be simple, direct and easily understood. The present complexity and variety of the primary laws are reason for the voters' lack of confidence in their verdict and, as a consequence, for the ease with which

conventions may set all verdicts aside with comparative impunity.

How can a real presidential primary law be obtained and what should be its leading features? On the assumption that if the party is injured anywhere it will suffer everywhere, some may advocate leaving the whole matter to state legislatures under the influence of the national party organizations. But this is a big country and California often does not know what Maine is doing. The presidency is much too vital an office to leave exposed to the consequences of peanut politics in some out-of-the-way state. If the voters of the country could read the accounts in Missouri papers of old-fashioned, packed, gavel-ruled caucuses and conventions held there in the process of selecting national delegates, most of them would call for extended application of legal regulation, if not for the direct primary.

Parties could require uniform presidential primaries but they are unlikely to do so. The politician does not love simplicity and directness. They are bad for his business. To illustrate, both parties tolerate a most shameful inequality in the representation of party strength in conventions. Besides, party regulations attempted now would run into perplexing conflicts with existing state laws. No effective presidential primary is in sight unless it comes by federal law. President Wilson's first message to congress called for a federal enactment and several bills were introduced. All of these, as likewise Senator Cummins' bill of 1911, seem to have lodged in committee. Their authors took for granted the constitutionality of these proposals, but several authorities with good show of reason believe it beyond the power of congress to enact such measures. The senate resolution for the present investigation of presidential campaign expenditures, before and after the conventions, seems not to have raised the question of constitutionality. If constitutional amendment is necessary it may prove preferable to legislation even if more difficult to secure, for it could remodel the whole system of electing the president and vice-president. Here are certainly obvious faults, the correction of which is more essential to popular government than the modification effected by the twelfth amendment was to party integrity. The time has probably passed, if indeed it ever existed, when we are benefited by a system of electing a president which calls for all the excitement, effort, and expense of a five months' campaign, only to give the office to the candidate who polls thousands of votes fewer than his opponent. There would seem to exist no fundamental ground for serious popular opposition to the change. Is the time not ripe for comprehensive changes in the constitution?

In the matter of nominating the president, it would probably be safe to grant congress the same powers that it now possesses with reference to the election of its own members. Conceded this power for congress, what regulations would remove the defects mentioned above? The present convention system might have some staunch defenders. No less distinguished a person than Andrew D. White, however, in 1912, called the presidential convention "a blot on American democracy" and "simply the most contemptible of amateur shows," mainly because of the disorder and the crowding of spectators. The plea for the convention as a deliberate body no longer deceives the most unsophisticated. The pre-convention prophecy of Mr. Harry Daugherty, Senator Harding's manager, needed no such literal fulfillment as it received in order to convince the public of the kind of deliberation for which conven-

tions are most fitted or best adapted. The "discussion of all the candidates by all the delegates," as the end sought by the Republican voters in selecting uninstructed delegations according to the New York county chairman, would not have materialized had the convention been as unbossed and leaderless as it was reported. It is highly improbable that any body of 1,000 persons will prove deliberative under any circumstances, and most improbable in the presence of 15,000 spectators, to whom deliberation is anything but welcome. The belief in the possibility of a deliberative convention would be much easier if the electoral college had had a different history. The old campaign advice is still good and closely followed: "Get the delegates." If parties had really desired deliberative conventions, they would long ago have excluded spectators and reduced the number of delegates.

The majority or two-thirds vote of a convention is largely another fiction, and thus is destroyed another claim of convention advocates that primary nomination often rests on a minority, whereas a convention's choice is the choice of a majority. Does anyone suppose that Senator Harding's majority and Governor Cox's two-thirds were the result of the sincere conversion of any considerable number of those delegates who had at first opposed them?

A third common convention fiction is that convention nominations are cheap to secure in comparison with primary nominations. If these three arguments for the convention system are destroyed, its supposed value is much reduced.

THE POSSIBILITIES IN THE PRIMARY

There are four fairly distinct functions which a presidential primary might perform:

(1) It might fully determine the nomination, as state primaries usually do. No convention would then be held except for framing the platform.

(2) The primary might serve as an optional popular referendum on the selection of candidates by representative party agencies.

(3) The primary might be designed to influence the convention, perhaps limiting its range of choice but not absolutely controlling it.

(4) No influence at all might be given to the primary. It would only fool the voters, create party strife, afford an opportunity for publicity to men who, or whose friends, could afford it. For these purposes the primary is at present pretty well constituted. A primary of the last type is comparatively useless if not, in some of its incidents, harmful. There is some argument in support of a primary of the third type, but it is difficult to combine direct primary and convention satisfactorily. In fact such a primary system would be more nearly a modified convention system. Either the first or the second type could quite certainly be made most simple, direct, and effective.

Regardless of which of these types might be adopted, certain regulations should be applied. A uniform day is essential. This of itself will attract greater interest and participation. A separate presidential primary demands more civic activity than many voters will undertake, consequently, the presidential primary date should be set sometime in September so that states may conveniently hold their primaries on the same day. Some states now combine these primaries by holding the latter in the spring, in the presidential years, if not every year. State primaries, however, come generally in the latter part of August or in September. Senator Cummins' bill fixed the first of August for the election of delegates.

Why a nomination in June? The British can conduct a general election campaign satisfactorily in a few weeks; it would be strange if six weeks should not suffice here. There would be much advantage in the combined primary to compensate for the longer ballot and possible confusion of issues. The expense of a separate primary would be saved.

Party registration must be required. A separate federal party enrollment by federal officials could be provided but this would be very expensive in proportion to its accuracy and thoroughness. Its cost would be out of proportion to its use. It would seem wiser to use state election officials for this purpose. The state enrollment might be accepted on the basis of state definition of party membership, but in order to permit a separation of national and state politics the federal law could well require a separate federal enroll nent applicable not only to the presidential primary but to the primary for the nomination of senators and representatives also. It would not be difficult to permit to voters dissatisfied with the decisions of state officials on this point an appeal to some federal official.

Of course a limitation should be placed on the expenditure of money in connection with the presidential nomination, accompanied by the most advanced corrupt practices and publicity enactments. The presidency must not even appear to be obtainable by financial means nor should the nomination system be such as encourage immoderate expenditure on the part of aspirants. Printing and speaking are the cheapest means of campaigning for a prominent office. The federal government could use its mails to carry to every voter the printed argument of every aspirant, and in addition pay for the printing. No other means of campaigning need be allowed. Paid newspaper advertising should certainly be entirely prohibited. If an aspirant worthy of the office has anything to say, the press will report him. That some candidates would have more editorial support than others would be certain but practically unavoidable. A sufficient degree of equality can be introduced. Primary after primary has shown that the race is by no means always to the most lavish spender nor to the man with the most extensive newspaper following.

HOW TO SIFT CANDIDATES FOR THE NOMINATION

Now comes the crux of all proposals for change—the specific method of designation and nomination. Whether an improved, responsible convention system or a finally decisive direct primary is considered most desirable, designations could be made in the following manner. All aspirants that have any real chance for nomination should have easy access to the ballot; others should if possible be excluded, especially "favorite sons." There is no doubt that ordinarily candidates having a chance of nomination will with few exceptions be those who are supported by considerable groups of congressmen and state political leaders. It would be somewhat strange if this were not true. The character of these persons, their likes and dislikes, if our elective process means anything, should be fairly representative of the popular attitude toward the aspirants. There will be little use in other aspirants applying. This fact should be recognized in the law, which could well provide that any aspirant polling on a single ballot say 20 per cent of a total vote of a college composed of all congressmen and state committeemen should be officially designated. The vote of each member of the college should be published. The

varying numbers of state committee members could be readily equated. Other aspirants perhaps should be allowed to enter the race by some petition method. This method of designation ought to minimize the necessary expenditures of the aspirants and in some degree permit the office to seek the man. Some one may object that the aspirants will move the campaign back to the designating college. It is to be expected. No primary system can be devised which will be free from pre-primary effort. The most that can be hoped is a large degree of publicity and responsibility. Another person objects that this means a partial union of the executive and the legislative. The present system is a gross violation of the spirit of the principle of separation of legislative and executive powers, and of the requirement that no member of congress or federal office-holder be chosen a presidential elector. The evils of the disregard of this principle are not apparent at present in any undesirable control of congress over the executive, if the record of the last twenty years means anything. Who are the national delegates now but the leading party and public officials of the states and nation? If public opinion disapproves this role for congressmen, they need not be included in the college.

IF THE CONVENTION NOMINATES

If a convention is to make the nominations following a preference-primary, defects (4), (5), (6) and (7)[1] could be largely remedied by the following procedure: Let the popular party vote be taken only on the aspirants; let this vote determine the portion of the state's quota of delegates (proportioned to the party strength in the state) to which each aspirant is entitled; each aspirant then select his delegates; the convention be confined to the designated aspirants in the selection of a candidate. The delegates can be left perfectly free in the matter of pledges, each will honestly desire the nomination of the man who selected him. The weight of influence of a nation-wide primary in which all aspirants participated would be well-nigh irresistible.

[1] See page 608.

IF THE CONVENTION IS ABOLISHED

The primary's verdict may be made final and the convention abolished. If this plan is adopted the variation in the state suffrage qualifications and the very probable variation in the extent of participation in the states due to the presence or absence of state contests would render unfair a nomination by plurality of the popular party vote. It is suggested for each state that the popular vote for each aspirant be translated first into terms of the electoral vote of the state and that each electoral vote be weighted in proportion to the party strength in the state. The simplest system that would allow the population and party strength of each state an influence proportionate to those of other states would be the best. A plurality of this resultant vote should nominate.

THE PARTY ORGANIZATION MAY NOMINATE SUBJECT TO APPEAL

There is much to be said in favor of the second type of primary mentioned above. It has yet to receive a fair trial in the United States. For state nominations it was strongly advocated by Governor Hughes of New York. Briefly stated, it consists in a frank recognition of the power of political organizations in largely controlling nominations under any pri nary system. For this control they are at

present not usually held in any way legally responsible. They act unofficially but effectively. People say, "Why go to the primary, you can't beat the organization." Why not recognize in law the organization's power and attempt to control it and make it responsible and visible, retaining always a popular appeal, which, in effect, is all that the direct primary amounts to in so many instances as to make it the rule, at least in the eastern states? In a former article,[1] the writer recommended the selection at the general election of a body of party representatives to make the designations for the succeeding election, subject to a decision at the primary only if competing designations should be made by petition. To adopt this system in its entirety for presidential nominations would presuppose its existence in all of the states. An adaptation of it, however, could be nationally applied. The party representative body in any state which might have adopted that system, and the regular state committees in the other states, could be permitted to select delegates to a national convention which would designate the party candidate for president. Presidential aspirants should be put before the convention by some simple petition system which would require a few signatures in each of several states. The vote of the state committees should be taken on these presidential aspirants and the aspirants be permitted to select their own delegates. The vote of each committeeman should be published. After the national conventions should have made their designations, opportunity should be afforded for designations by petition. Here also the petitioners required should not be so numerous that their names could not be conveniently published over the country. If no rival designations should be made, the convention designees would automatically become the party nominees. It is of course essential that state committeemen be responsible to the party voters.

Had this system been employed in 1912, it is not improbable that a Republican convention would have designated Mr. Taft, and that Mr. Roosevelt would have become the rival designee in a primary. A Democratic convention would probably have designated Mr. Clark, who would have been compelled to compete with Mr. Wilson in a primary. In 1916 Mr. Wilson would have been the undisputed Democratic designee, and very likely Mr. Hughes would have occupied the same position in the Republican party. This year the Republican outcome in convention would have been difficult to foretell, but if Senator Harding had been designated, it is very certain that he would have had to compete with one or more rivals in a nation-wide primary. A Democratic convention would probably have designated Mr. McAdoo and there might have been an appeal to the party membership by Attorney-General Palmer or Governor Cox or both. If there is a candidate preferred by a popular majority, or large plurality, this system offers every opportunity for his nomination, with or without a primary. If there is no such candidate, no system,—convention or primary,—will create one.

It is one of the first essentials of the success of popular government that the people believe it is popular and have confidence in its representative character and responsiveness. There is not lacking evidence that this condition does not obtain to a satisfactory extent respecting the election of the chief magistrate of the United States.

[1] NATIONAL MUNICIPAL REVIEW for September, 1919; also the writer's study, "The Direct Primary in New Jersey," made under the auspices of the Bureau of State Research of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

TABULAR STATEMENT OF VOTE AT PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES 1912, 1916 AND 1920.

(Votes are indicated in thousands: 000 omitted)

	Calif.	Ind.	Ill.	Iowa	Md.	Mass.	Mich.	Minn.	Mont.	Neb.	N. H.	N. J.	N. Y.	N. C.	N. D.	Ohio	Ore.	Pa.	S. D.	Vt.	W. Va.	Wis.
1912																						
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES																						
Roosevelt	139	[a]	267	[a]	30	83	[a]	[a]	[a]	47	[a]	61			24	[a]	29	274	38	[a]	[a]	
Taft	69		127		27	87				13		44	[a]	[a]	2		21	193	20			47
LaFollette	46		43							17		3			34		22		11			133
[i] *Percentage of party election vote cast at primary*	*87%*		*68%*		*50%*	*58%*				*61%*		*40%*			*122%*		*68%*	*70%*	*110%*			*94%*
DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES																						
Clark	43		218		35	35				21							8					36
Wilson	17		76		23	15				14		48				89	10	98				45
Harmon					7					12						100						
[i] *Percentage of party election vote cast at primary*	*21%*		*72%*		*57%*	*29%*				*46%*		*28%*				*46%*	*52%*	*38%*	*25%*			*50%*
1916																						
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES																						
Various candidates or unpledged delegates	220	176	156	[b]		105	123	71	6	87	13	No names on ballot	146	[a]	33	122		270	40	No names on ballot[j]		110
[i] *Percentage of party election vote cast at primary*	*48%*	*51%*	[f]*30%*			*39%*	*52%*	*39%*	*9%*	*75%*	*31%*		*17%*		*60%*	*27%*		*38%*	*63%*			*50%*
DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES				[b]																		
Wilson	75	160	137			20	85	45	9	70	6	25	112		12	85		142	18	4		109
[i] *Percentage of party election vote cast at primary*	*16%*	*50%*	[f]*30%*			*8%*	*30%*	*25%*	*8%*	*50%*	*15%*	*12%*	*15%*		*22%*	*14%*		*27%*	*31%*	*18%*		*56%*
1920																						
REPUBLICAN CANDIDATES																						
Wood		86	158	[a]	19		112	[a]	7	42	9	53		6		108	44	[g]4	31	3	51	
Johnson	370	80	45		10		156		21	63	2	32		15	30		46		26			
Lowden		40	222				62		6								16		26			
Hoover	290						52		5								15					
Harding		21							1							123						
Various candidates or unpledged delegates						93	25			30	4		[c]243					258				188
[i] *Percentage of party election vote cast at primary*	*125%*	*66%*	[f]*37%*			*25%*	*31%*	[d]*60%*		*60%*	[k]*114%*	*35%*	*39%*	*28%*	*17%*	*67%*	*50%*	*95%*	*40%*	[g]*67%*	*12%*	*31%*	*35%*
DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES																						
Palmer							11											80				
Cox		No names on ballot	No names on ballot				11		No names on ballot			No names on ballot		No names on ballot		88				No names on ballot	No names on ballot	
McAdoo							18										25	[h]27				
Bryan							17															
Edwards							16															
Various candidates or unpledged delegates	23					22	[e]24			5	6		[c]113		6				7			
[i] *Percentage of party election vote cast at primary*	*5%*					*9%*	[d]*16%*			*35%*	*16%*		*15%*		*12%*	*14%*	*21%*	*21%*	*6%*			

[a] Law not in effect this year.
[b] Figures not obtainable.
[c] Women were granted suffrage in 1917.
[d] Women were granted suffrage in 1918.
[e] No presidential preference primary held for Republican candidates.
[f] Hoover, 24,000.
[g] Gen. Wood's name was not on the ballot. E. W. Wood received 258,000 votes.
[h] McAdoo's name was not on the ballot.
[i] Based on popular vote for Taft and Roosevelt.
[j] For 1916, based on half party vote; for 1920 on total party vote, because women could vote in the primary.
[k] Presidential suffrage for women, 1917.